

Chapter 13

ADRIAN ROBU – Université de Fribourg, Fribourg
adrianrobu@yahoo.com

What's in a Name? Megarian *apoikiai* in the Black Sea: Common *nomima* and Local Traditions*

The Megarians were one of the most active colonizers between the eighth and sixth centuries BCE, founding *apoikiai* (“colonies”) in Sicily (Megara Hyblaia, Selinous), on the coasts of the Sea of Marmara (Astakos, Chalkedon, Selymbria, Byzantion), and along the Black Sea (Herakleia Pontike, Mesambria). At the same time, Megara was often not the only city who participated in the establishment of these settlements overseas: the literary and epigraphic sources attest the collaboration of Megarians with other groups of settlers from Greece (especially from Boiotia, Argos, and Corinth) and from their own colonies (Megara Hyblaia and Chalkedon), in the foundation and the development of their *apoikiai*. We may consider these foundations as the result of a *synoikismos*, or combination of several groups of settlers, often ethnically heterogeneous.¹

It is also certain that groups of further settlers (*epoikoi*) from Megara or other cities continued to arrive in the colonies. For example, Aristotle reports that a conflict (*stasis*)

* My warm thanks go to Hans Beck and Philip J. Smith for their kind invitation to participate in the workshop on Megara in Montreal, I was pleased to participate during the two days of the colloquium in stimulating discussions and debates.

¹ Robu 2012: 181–183.

occurred at Byzantion because of such new settlers, and the result of these political troubles was the eviction of the second settlers (*Pol.* 5.3.11–12, 1303a 25–34).

In addition, Megarian colonisation constituted the framework where institutional and religious transfers between the Aegean Sea, Sicily, and the Black Sea took place. We find in the *apoikiai* several cults and magistracies inherited from the Megarian metropolis. Some of them are also present in the second-generation colonies that Herakleia Pontike founded on the West and the North coasts of the Black Sea (Kallatis and Chersonesos Taurike), as well as inland in Asia Minor (Kieros, a city renamed Prusias-ad-Hypium, in early Hellenistic times).

It should be noted here that “colony” and “colonisation” are conventional terms and not to be understood in their modern meaning; “colonisation” describes here an Ancient Greek phenomenon, the main result of which was the foundation of Greek cities overseas, and the establishment of cultural links and relations between the metropolis and the new settlements.²

It is not my intention to enter into the heated debate on the exact meaning of the term Greek “colonisation”.³ I will, rather, confine my discussion to the Megarian institutions attested in the Black Sea cites, and also to the interactions between various actors within the framework of Megarian colonisation. Firstly, I will discuss the cults and the calendars of the Megarian cities, and then, their civic subdivisions and magistracies. Secondly, I will focus on the relations between Megara and the Pontic cities. In this context, I will examine an epigraphical habit attested at Kallatis and Tauric Chersonesos, and briefly discuss the onomastics of Megara and her Pontic colonies. In my analysis, I have also included Byzantion and Chalkedon, two foundations at the entrance of the Black Sea. Owing to their geographical position, these cites belonged to the Sea of Marmara and Black Sea areas, in antiquity.⁴

² Lepore 1978: 230–232.

³ See recently Malkin 2016.

⁴ Robu 2014b: 189–190.

Several scholars have tried in the past to identify the Megarian component among the institutions of the colonies.⁵ I have also dealt with this topic in my book on Megara and her colonies, pointing also the way in which the metropolis’ traditions changed in the *apoikiai*.⁶ I wish to revisit here this topic, focusing less on the origin of institutions, and more on the institutional developments in the colonies. This is an important subject, since later evolutions had mainly contributed to the creation of local traditions and institutional practices in the Megarian colonies.

Furthermore, one might wonder if all the *nomima* were reproduced during the colonial establishment in the Archaic period, at the very moment of the foundation of the new cities, or shortly after. Since several documents suggest that contacts between Megara and the Black Sea cities occurred during the Classical and Hellenistic periods, it is my intention to underline here the importance of these documents for the study of relations between metropoleis and *apoikiai* in antiquity.

The *nomima* of the Colonies: Metropolis Traditions and Local Developments

As Irad Malkin has shown in his book *A Small Greek World*, the *nomima* were certainly not neutral. They constituted “a set of practical, organizing data for society,” such as civic subdivisions, magistracies, cults and sacred calendars. In short, the *nomima* “were vital to the social, political, and religious organization of a Greek polis.”⁷

For ancient Greeks, *nomima* served as identifiers of a colony as “Chalkidian”, “Milesian” or “Megarian”. For example, the city of Himera, on the northeastern shore of Sicily, was founded by Chalkidians from Zankle and the Myletidai, an exiled clan from Syracuse. So, Himera was a mixed colony with three *oikistai*, Eukleides, Simos, and Sakon. According to Thucydides (6.5.1), the language of the Himerians was a mixture of Chalkidic and Doric, but the Chalkidian *nomima* were dominant.⁸

5 Hanell 1934: 137–204; Antonetti 1997; Antonetti 1999; Avram in *ISM* III 85–115.

6 Robu 2014a: 325–405.

7 Malkin 2011: 189–197; see also D’Ercole 2012: 81–93.

8 καὶ φωνὴ μὲν μεταξὺ τῆς τε Χαλκιδέων καὶ Δωριέος ἐκράθη, νόμιμα δὲ τὰ Χαλκιδικὰ ἐκράτησεν.

In some cases, we might note the desire of the *apoikoi* to perpetuate the ethnic of the metropolis, at least within the first generations of settlers. For example, the Liparaians consecrated several bronze statues at Delphi. A dedicatory inscription from the first half of the fifth century BCE gives us the ethnic “the Knidians at Lipara”.⁹ Later, at the end of fourth century or beginning of the third century BCE, Delphic inscriptions mention only the Liparaians (Λιπαράῖοι). Clearly, at this time, the Knidian origin was no longer relevant.¹⁰ It should be added that Lipara was not founded solely by Knidians but was established by Knidians and Rhodians under the leadership of Pentathlos of Knidos, around 580–576 BCE.¹¹ The Liparaians chose, however, to present themselves at Delphi only as Knidians, probably because the Knidians settlers were dominant at Lipara, and the Knidians’ institutions prevailed among the *nomima* of the city. The ethnic origin of the main group of settlers and the *nomima* of the colony served as identity-markers vis-à-vis the other Greeks. This was especially relevant at Delphi, a sanctuary which achieved Panhellenic fame in the Archaic and Classical periods.

The Megarian settlers also chose to show their ethnic origin. The name of Megara of Sicily reflects the desire of the *apoikoi* to reveal their Megarian origin. Besides, some ancient authors attribute the foundation of second-generation colonies to Megara, while others present these cities as *apoikiai* established by settlers from Megara *and* her colonies. Mesambria was, for example, qualified as a Megarian settlement by Strabo (7.6.1, C 319), but as a foundation of Megarians and Chalkedonians by Ps.-Skymnos (738–742). The two traditions are not contradictory, since Chalkedon was a Megarian foundation and the Chalkedonians could be viewed as Megarian in respect to their ethnic origin and institutions.¹²

There is also the case of the sophist Herodikos of Selymbria who, according to Plato (*Prt.* 316d–e), has a Megarian origin.¹³ Herodikos may have had double citizenship, being considered a Megarian and a Selymbrian. It is much more probable that Plato wanted to

⁹ τοὶ Κνίδιοι [ἐ]λ Λιπάραι: *FD* III.4.2, no. 181.

¹⁰ *FD* III.4.2, nos. 182–183; cf. Vatin 1993a: 74; Vatin 1993b.

¹¹ Diod. 5.9; cf. Fischer-Hansen, Nielsen, Ampolo 2004: 211.

¹² Loukopoulou 1989: 53.

¹³ Ἡρόδικος ὁ Σηλυμβριανός, τὸ δὲ ἀρχαῖον Μεγαρεύς.

reveal the Megarian origin of Selymbria by qualifying Herodikos as *archaion Megareus*. In other terms, Herodikos was citizen of Selymbria, but his ethnos was originally Megarian.¹⁴

The study of the cults and political institutions of the Megarian colonies confirms that, in these fields, the *apoikiai* preserved much of the metropolis' traditions. The religious sphere was especially marked by the metropolis' influence. Several Megarian cults are documented in the colonies. The first settlers might have established some of the traditions, while others might have been introduced later into the colonies, as will be described below. We can include in this list several gods and goddesses attested for both at Megara and in the colonies, sometimes with a typically Megarian *epiklēsis*. Such is the case for the following deities: Apollo Pythaios at Chalkedon, Apollo Agyieus at Byzantion, Kallatis, and Anchialos (a Mesambrian possession in Hellenistic period), Artemis Orthosia at Byzantion, Demeter Malophoros and Zeus Meilichios at Selinous, Demeter Malophoros at Anchialos, Dionysos Patroos, Dionysos Dasyllios, Dionysos Bakchios, Apollo Apotropaios, and Athena Polias at Kallatis.¹⁵ In addition, Megarian heroes, like Polyeidios, Ajax, Saron and Hipposthenes at Byzantion, were also celebrated in the colonies.¹⁶

It is understood that not all the cults and festivals of the colonies find parallels in the mother city, and it is not methodologically sound to study the pantheons of the *apoikiai* based solely on the traditions of the metropolis. So far, despite the large number of excavations and archeological finds at Selinous, the hypothesis of M. Torell, which states that the sacred topography of this city is a perfect reflection of those of Megara Nisaia, is not confirmed.¹⁷ It is important to remember that modern reconstruction of the sacred landscape of Megara is mainly based on Pausanias. This author gives us information on the cults celebrated during the second century CE, but the pantheon of Roman Megara is not entirely the same as the pantheon of Archaic or Classical Megara. We find, for instance, no mention of a sanctuary of Poseidon, in Pausanias, yet Thucydides (4.118.4) tells us that this

¹⁴ Vatin 1993a: 79; Robu 2012: 186.

¹⁵ Hanell 1934: 161-188; Antonetti 1997: 83-94; Avram in *ISM* III 91-95; Chiekova: 2008: 60-67, 87-107, 119-124; Robu 2012: 190; Robu 2016a: 183-187.

¹⁶ Hanell 1934: 188-189.

¹⁷ Coarelli and Torelli 1984: 81-103; Torelli 2005: 8.

god had a cult site in the Megarian harbour town of Nisaia in the Classical period. Poseidon is also well attested in the colonies at Selinous, Astakos, Byzantion, Chalkedon, Herakleia Pontike, and Kallatis.¹⁸

The *apoikoi* were largely innovative in the cultic sphere, though other elements were also important in the establishing of the pantheon of the colonies. We might note that Herakles has a central place in the pantheon of Herakleia Pontike, and this is probably due to the Boiotians who joined the Megarians for the foundation of the city.¹⁹ After all, the cult of Herakles is well attested in Boiotia²⁰ and poorly documented in Megaris.²¹ The Boiotians also joined the Megarians in the foundation of Byzantion; the celebration of Schoiniklos, a Boiotian hero, by the Byzantians, might well corroborate this tradition.²²

As is to be expected, the pantheons evolved differently in the metropolis and in the colonies: Apollo was celebrated as Pythios, Archegetes, and Dekatophoros at Megara, while the god was honoured as Pythaios and Chresterios at Chalkedon (the last *epiklēsis* reminds us that Apollo has oracular powers in the colony²³). The cults of Dionysos at Megara and at Kallatis exhibit several similarities, but also some differences. The Megarians celebrated Dionysos Patroos and Dionysos Dasyllios in the same sanctuary. The statue of Dionysos Patroos is considered by Pausanias as the oldest one (1.43.5.). The two *epiklēseis* of the god are attested at Kallatis, but here Dionysos Dasyllios seems to have preeminence, since the god is named only by the *epiklēsis* Dasyllios in a list of divinities,²⁴ and his sanctuary, the Dasylleion, is mentioned alone in another inscription.²⁵

Moreover, new divinities were celebrated in the colonies in the Archaic and Classical periods. Such is the case of Herakles, for instance, the main divinity of Herakleia Pontike, who was celebrated as Pharangeites by an association of Herakleotes established in

18 Antonetti 1997: 89–90; Robu 2013: 75–76.

19 Burstein 1976: 17; *contra* Herda 2016: 89–95.

20 Schachter 1986: 1–37.

21 Smith 2008: 123.

22 Hanell 1934: 189–190; Robu 2014a: 264–269.

23 Antonetti 1999: 17–24.

24 *ISM* III 48 A.

25 *ISM* III 47; cf. Avram in *ISM* III 91, 97.

Imperial times at Kallatis.²⁶ As Édouard Chirica (1998) has shown, the *epiklēsis* Pharangeites is connected to the word φάραγξ (“ravine”), and, according to a mythological tradition, the ravine and the cave that served as the entrance for Herakles to descend to the underworld were situated in the territory of Herakleia Pontike. Local mythology and topography became the source for new religious traditions in the colonies.

The same concept can be applied to Parthenos, the main deity of Tauric Chersonesos, who is generally identified with Artemis, a divinity well attested at Megara and her colonies.²⁷ However, this is still a matter of dispute,²⁸ and the cult of Parthenos could merely be interpreted as a local development of the metropolis’ *nomima* in the Chersonesos.

The calendars of the Megarian colonies, moreover, illustrate a common heritage, and at the same time local evolutions. In Megara, only the name of a single month is known, the month Panamos, which is attested by a decree founded at Pagai, that concerns a territorial dispute between Aigosthena and Pagai.²⁹ Yet the documents from Byzantion, Chalkedon, Kallatis and Chersonesos Taurike provide us with the ability to identify several months the Megarian colonies from the Black Sea share in common. Based on this evidence, the Archaic Megarian calendar was restored as follows by Alexandru Avram: Heraios, Karneios, Machaneios, Petageitnios, Dionysios, Eukleios, Artemisios, Lykeios, Apellaos, Panamos (?), Agrianios, Malophorios.³⁰

Several months in this list are connected with Megarian divinities (for example, Demeter Malophoros was celebrated during the month Malophorios), but it is still difficult to know if all these months were actually present at Megara. Here caution is needed, and it is probably not fortuitous that the only month attested in the metropolis (Panamos) is never previously mentioned by the documents from the colonies, until now.³¹ We know also that some months of the original Megarian calendar were replaced in the colonies by new ones. We find the month Bosporios at Byzantion, and the month Herakleios at

²⁶ ISM III 72.

²⁷ Makarov and Ushakov 2008; Dana 2012.

²⁸ Guldager Bilde 2009.

²⁹ Robert 1939: 107–108.

³⁰ Avram 1999; cf. Trümper 1997: 147–155.

³¹ Avram in ISM III 114.

Chersonesos and probably also at her metropolis, Herakleia Pontike. The first month is connected to the local festival, Bosporia, while the second is related to Herakles. As we already noted, Herakles was celebrated particularly in Boiotia, not in Megaris, and the Boiotians were, along with the Megarians, the founders of Herakleia Pontike, Chersonesos' mother city (see above).

Moreover, the political institutions of Megara and of her Pontic cities present several analogies. The Megarians were organized into three Dorian tribes, the *phylai Hylleis*, *Dymanes*, and *Pamphyloi*, and also into several *hekatostyes* ("hundreds"). The tripartite division of the civic body is attested in the Megarian *apoikiai*: boards of three or six magistrates (*nomophylakes*, *stratēgoi*) are present in the Hellenistic period at Byzantion, Chalkedon, Mesambria, Herakleia Pontike and her colonies, Kallatis and Chersonesos. The *hekatostyes* were civic subdivisions in Byzantion, Chalkedon, and Herakleia Pontike.³²

The main magistracies and civic structures of Megara appear in the colonies. An eponymous *basileus* is attested for at Chalkedon and Herakleia Pontike, in the Herakleote colonies, Kallatis, Chersonesos, and Prusias-ad-Hypium/Kieros, and was also present at Mesambria. Of the other magistracies of Hellenistic Megara, the most important were the *probouloi*, the *stratagoi*, and the *aisimnatai*. The *probouloi* are attested at Kallatis, the *stratagoi* at Byzantion, Chalkedon, Selymbria, Mesambria, Herakleia Pontike and Kallatis, and the *aisimnatai* at Chalkedon and Selinous. In addition, three other boards of magistrates that are present in the colonies might have a Megarian origin: the *damiorgoi* of Herakleia Pontike and Chersonesos, the *nomophylakes* of Chalkedon, Mesambria and Chersonesos, and the *symnamones* of Chersonesos.³³

Despite the similarities with the Megarian magistracies, the institutions of the colonies developed distinctly. In Hellenistic times, the *aisimnatai* at Chalkedon and the *probouloi* at Kallatis are among the democratic institutions of these cities. Moreover, they present common features with the Athenian prytany system: monthly duties and, at least at Chalkedon, election by civic subdivision.³⁴ Some scholars suggested that the *aisimnatai* of

32 Hanell 1934: 138-144; Ferraioli 2012: 13-84; Robu 2014a: 325-360.

33 Hanell 1934: 144-160; Robu 2014a: 366-405.

34 Avram 1994; Avram in *ISM* III 87; Robu 2014a: 347, 382-389.

Megara had similar functions as the Athenian *prytaneis*,³⁵ but the available documentation can hardly support this view.³⁶

In my view, it is not necessary to think that the Chalkedonians and the Kallatians imported a democratic system from Megara, but rather, that they adapted the Athenian model to their local institutions. It should be noted that the *aisimnatai* were elected at Chalkedon by *hekatostyes* (“hundreds”), civic subdivisions of Megarian origin. As a comparison, the Kyzikans also had *prytaneis* serving for a month, but they were elected according to the six tribes of Miletos, their metropolis. They also did not create a ten-tribe system as in Kleisthenic Athens.³⁷ It appears clear that the civic institutions are inspired both by the traditions of the metropolis and the Athenian model, resulting in the emergence of new local traditions in the civic field.

The *praisimnōn* of Kallatis and the *proaisymnōn* of Chersonesos are also reminiscent of the board of *aisimnatai*, but we have no proof for the presence of *aisimnatai* in the two Pontic cities.³⁸ Some scholars suggested that five *aisimnatai* were present at Megara and/or in her *apoikiai*.³⁹ However, we have no indication of the number of *aisimnatai* at Megara. The only documents that give us information on this matter are from Chalkedon, and they attest nine *aisimnatai*,⁴⁰ and probably eleven *aisimnatai*.⁴¹ Certainly, we cannot exclude the possibility that the college of *aisimnatai* had five members at Megara – elected on the level of a system of five units that were probably in place during the Hellenistic period – as did the college of the *damiorgoi*, and sometimes the college of the *stratagoi*. At the same time, the *aisimnatai* could have been elected by the three Dorian tribes (*phylai*), and, if so, we could have a college of six *aisimnatai* (two magistrates by tribe), following the example of the six *stratagoi* attested in Megara during the third century BCE.⁴²

35 Meyer 1932: 199; Hanell 1934: 146.

36 See, especially, the decree IG VII.15.

37 Hasluck 1910: 250–252; Lewis 1984: 56–57.

38 Avram in *ISM* III 86–87.

39 Loukopoulou 1989: 143; Malkin 2011: 195.

40 *I. Kalchedon* 7.

41 *I. Kalchedon* 6, but this inscription might be fragmentary.

42 Robu 2014: 391–394.

This brief summary of Megarian *nomima* permits us to conclude that the main political and religious institutions of Megara were transferred into the colonies. These elements confirm the major role played by the Megarians in the foundation of the *apoikiai*, despite the fact that other Greeks participated in the process of colonisation. Local developments are also well documented and we have to bear in mind that the colonies are not mirror images of the metropolis. There are at least two reasons for this. Firstly, the colonies were often ethnically heterogeneous, and other traditions, like the Boiotian, for instance, were important for establishing the *nomima* of the colonies. Secondly, the institutional traditions of other cities were equally as important as those of the metropolis in later periods. For example, Athenian institutions probably served as a model for the Chalkedonians and Kallatians in the Hellenistic period.

A central question to consider is the date of the transfer of Megarian *nomima* to the *apoikiai*, since the relations between the colonies and the metropoleis are generally not limited to the Archaic period. Several cultural transfers between the metropoleis and the colonies occurred at the time of the foundation of the colonies, or shortly after. Other elements were, I think, probably transferred during the Classical and Hellenistic periods.

Cultural Transfers and Relations between Megara and Pontic Cities

We must admit that the relations between Megara and her Pontic colonies are poorly documented. This is rather exceptional, given that for other colonizing cities, the contacts between the metropolis and the *apoikiai* are firmly established from the Archaic to the Hellenistic, and even Imperial times. Such is the case for the Corinthian settlements: the links between Corinth, Korkyra and Epidamnus, or between Corinth and Syracuse⁴³ are well attested for long after the foundation period. We also know that *apoikiai* were still founded during the Classical period: the city of Dikaia in the Northern Aegean was established by the Eretrians at the beginning of the fifth century.⁴⁴

43 Reichert-Südbeck 2000: 11-17; Stickler 2010: 225-229.

44 Voutiras 2008; Knoepfler 2008: 614-616.

Several documents also attest to the close relations between Paros and her colonies, Thasos and Pharos.⁴⁵ In the third century BCE, Pharos faced a very difficult financial situation after being destroyed in the Second Illyrian War. In this context, an inscription demonstrates that Pharos asked for the support of the metropolis. The Parians decided to help their *apoikoi*, but not before they consulted the Delphic oracle. Apollo recommended that the Parians should help the Pharians reconstruct their city, and in this way, we witness a refoundation of the colony in the Hellenistic period.⁴⁶

Milesian colonisation is also a good example of the survival of the colonial networks linking metropoleis and daughter cities from the Archaic through the Hellenistic period. Miletos concluded treaties of *sympoliteia* with Kyzikos, Chios, Olbia, and Istros during the fourth and third centuries BCE.⁴⁷ In the treaty with Chios, the Milesian *dēmos* is called “the founder of the colony” (*ktistes tēs apoikias*).⁴⁸ Relations between Miletos and her colonies existed even in the Imperial period: for example, according to an inscription from the Severan age, the college of *stephanophoroi* from Kyzikos decided to consult the oracle of Apollo Milesios in Didyma.⁴⁹

The contacts between Herakleia Pontike and her colonies are also well attested, especially in the Imperial period. We already noted that a religious association of Herakleotes is shown at Kallatis in the second century CE, and this group celebrates Herakles Pharangeites, a local god from Herakleia Pontike (see above). During the same period, the decree of Chersonesos, in honour of Thrasympedes, son of Thrasympedes, from “the metropolis Herakleia”, qualified the relation between the two cities as a father-son relationship.⁵⁰

All of these examples show that contacts between metropolis and *apoikiai* existed long after the foundation period. Was Megarian colonisation a different case? Several inscriptions from Kallatis and Chersonesos Taurike support the idea of the reactivation of colonial

45 Eck 2013.

46 *SEG* 23.489; cf. Hamon 2009: 106.

47 Ehrhardt 1987; Dana 2011: 363–364.

48 *Milet* I 3.141.1. 19–20; cf. Müller 2016.

49 Fontenrose 1988: 236, no. A 9, unfortunately the text of the oracle remains unknown.

50 *IOSPE* I².357; Dana 2011: 368–369.

networks between Megara and the Pontic cities during the Classical and Hellenistic periods.

First of all, two oracular inscriptions from Kallatis (*ISM* III 48 A and B) reflect similarities between the Kallatian and Megarian pantheons. These oracles were delivered by Apollo Pythios of Delphi, and they mention the divinities that the Kallatians have to celebrate. Several divinities in these lists bear *epiklēseis* attested also at Megara: Dionysos Patroos, Dionysos Dasyllios, Dionysos Bakchios, Apollo Apotropaïos.

Moreover, we note that Dionysos Patroos, Dionysos Dasyllios, Aphrodite and Peitho are listed together in *ISM* III 48 A (fourth century BCE). According to Pausanias (1.43.5–6), these divinities were celebrated at Megara in neighbouring sanctuaries close to the agora. Dionysos Patroos and Dionysos Dasyllios in the same sanctuary, while the statues of Peitho and of Paregoros were in the *temenos* of Aphrodite.⁵¹ Given that these two statues were the work of Praxiteles (active *c.* 370–320 BCE), we might infer that the celebration of Peitho at Megara dates probably to the fourth century BCE. If we accept a Megarian origin for the cult of Peitho and Aphrodite at Kallatis, then this tradition could not antedate the fourth century BCE. We have here a possible sign for the existence of cultural transfers between Megara and the *apoikiai* during the Classical period.⁵² Moreover, contacts between Megarians and Kallatians existed probably later, as is suggested by a Delphic decree for two Kallatians inscribed in the third century BCE on the Megarian treasury from Delphi.⁵³

The idea of connections between Megara and Kallatis in Classical-Hellenistic times is also supported by the presence of a specific epigraphic funerary habit at Megara, Kallatis, and Chersonesos. In these cities we find epitaphs inscribed on small rectangular tablets, which were inserted into free-standing stele. This habit was in use in Megara during Classical and Hellenistic times. It was probably during these periods that it was transferred to the

⁵¹ Avram and Lefèvre 1995: 18–21.

⁵² Robu 2016a.

⁵³ Avram and Lefèvre 1995: 16.

Pontic cities, since the tablets from Kallatis and Chersonesos do not date earlier than the fourth century BCE.⁵⁴

Finally, we might note the onomastic links between Megara and her colonies, and we may ask if this dates only to the Archaic period. We find a particular onomastic practice that we can qualify as Megarian in its colonies, at Byzantion and Selymbria, or we can also find names belonging to the region of Megaris and Boiotia.⁵⁵ This onomastic practice includes personal names such as Ἀθαναίων, Ἥρις, Μᾶτρις, Προμαθίων, Καλλίχορος, Τελαμών; names ending in -γείτος or in -γείτων (Καλλιγείτων, Ἡρόγείτος, Εὐγείτος/Εὐγείτων, Θεόγείτος/Θεογείτων); names ending in -κων (Μηνάκων, Ματρίκων, Ἡράκων, Εὐθάκων, Ἀθανίκων); or in -ιχος (Ἡρώιχος, Ζώτιχος, Σωτήριχος, κτλ.), names beginning with Πασ- (Πασίων, Πασέας, Πασιάδας, κτλ.), etc.⁵⁶

Nevertheless, new names appeared in the colonies, such as Βοσπόριχος, Βόσπων, Δηλόπτιχος at Byzantion, and Κοτυτίων and Κοτυτίς at Kallatis and Chersonesos. These names could be qualified as epichoric names and also as theophoric ones. Βοσπόριχος and Βόσπων refer to the festival of Bosporia, and Δηλόπτιχος refers to Deloptes, the companion of Bendis. Κοτυτίων and Κοτυτίς suggest the presence of the festival of the Kotyttia at Kallatis and Chersonesos. We might assume that it was originally Kotyttto, a Thracian deity, who was celebrated during the festival of Kotyttia. It is important to note that these epichoric names could be transferred from the colonies to the metropolis: for instance, Βόσπων is twice attested for in Hellenistic Megara. The Kotyttia are also mentioned by the *lex sacra* of Selinous,⁵⁷ and was a festival that probably arrived in Sicily through Megarian colonial networks.⁵⁸

⁵⁴ Robu 2016a; Robu 2016b.

⁵⁵ Robert 1959: 232, n. 9.

⁵⁶ Loukopoulou 1989: 203–209.

⁵⁷ Jameson, Jordan and Kotansky 1993: 14, col. A, l. 7.

⁵⁸ Robu 2010–2011.

Conclusion

Megarian colonisation allowed for human mobility, and facilitated cultural exchanges in the fields of religion, political institution, epigraphic culture, and onomastics. The cultural transfers between the metropolis and its colonies are not limited to Archaic times; they probably continued to occur during the Classical and Hellenistic periods. Such is the case of the Megarian cults attested at Kallatis, and this example raises the question of our view concerning the role of the documents from colonies in the reconstruction of institutions in Archaic Megara. Since some cults were transferred to Kallatis in the fourth century BCE, they may be able to help us to reconstruct only the Classical pantheon of Megara.

It is remarkable to find funerary tablets of the same type in Megara, Kallatis and Chersonesos. In other words, the epigraphic culture of these three cities shares common elements in the Hellenistic times. The onomastic evidence also shows the links between the Megarian cities and suggests that connections between these cities existed during the Classical, as well as the Hellenistic periods.

We should not infer that the relations between Megara and her *apoikiai* were uninterrupted in antiquity, however the common heritage could be invoked at different periods, especially by the political or cultural elites, to provide links between individuals or cities.⁵⁹ This was the case, particularly in the Imperial period, when Greek cities exhibited a passion for the past.⁶⁰

An anecdote reported by Philostratus may well illustrate this phenomenon: the sophist Markos from Byzantion considered the Megarian hero, Byzas, the mythical founder of Byzantion, as one of his ancestors. The philosopher was also quite politically active in his city, and he was sent as ambassador to the emperor Hadrian. During one of these trips, Markos visited Megara and put an end to a quarrel between the Megarians and the Athenians.⁶¹

⁵⁹ Müller 2016.

⁶⁰ Robert 1980: 412.

⁶¹ Philostratus, *The Lives of the Sophists*, 1.24.528–529, also remarks that the Megarians did not admit the Athenians to their Lesser Pythian games.

What is interesting in this local event is the fact that a dispute between two neighbouring cities was settled by an *apoikos* from a Megarian colonial city. The intervention of Markos from Byzantion shows us the capacity of the colonial networks to be revived centuries later.

With regard to the *apoikiai*, we might note the desire of Megarian colonies to preserve the main traditions of their metropolis, but also to reshape them in different ways. If the *apoikiai* could be identified as Megarian, especially regarding their *nomima*, the new settlements were also the hub of traditions linked to other *apoikoi* (for instance, the Boiotians), and of new local developments. The festival of the Bosporia at Byzantion, or the goddess Parthenos at Chersonesos Taurike were new cultic developments. We might wonder if it is useful to link them to a specific Megarian divinity, since the metropolis' tradition obviously could change in the colonial setup.

This study of institutions reveals a degree of diversity among the foundations and this is not contradictory to the desire of the colonists to imitate the civic structures of the metropolis. The Megarian *nomima* were reproduced by the founders, but also modified in the colonial setup and, in the end, they became a way to express Megarian localism in the *apoikiai*.

Bibliography

- Antonetti, C. 1997. "Megara e le sue colonie: un'unità storico-culturale ?" In: C. Antonetti (ed.), *Il dinamismo della colonizzazione greca. Atti della tavola rotonda: Espansione e colonizzazione greca di età arcaica. metodologie e problemi a confronto*. Naples: 83-94.
1999. "Le culte d'Apollon entre Mégare et ses colonies du Pont." In: Lordkipanidzé and Lévêque: 17-24.
- Avram, A. 1994. "Zur Verfassung von Kallatis in hellenistischer Zeit." *Il Mar Nero* 1: 167-177.
1999. "Les calendriers de Mégare et de ses colonies pontiques." In: Lordkipanidzé and Lévêque: 25-31.
- Avram, A. and F. Lefèvre. 1995. "Les cultes de Callatis et l'oracle de Delphes." *Revue des études grecques* 108: 7-23.
- Burstein, S.M. 1976. *Outpost of Hellenism. The Emergence of Heraclea on the Black Sea*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
- Chiekova, D. 2008. *Cultes et vie religieuse des cités grecques du Pont Gauche (VII^e-I^{er} siècle avant J.-C.)*. Bern.
- Chirica, É. 1998. "Le culte d'Héraclès Pharangeitès à Héraclée du Pont." *Revue des études grecques* 111: 722-732.
- Coarelli, F. and M. Torelli. 1984. *Guide archeologica Laterza. Sicilia*. Rome.
- Dana, M. 2011. *Culture et mobilité dans le Pont-Euxin. Approche régionale de la vie culturelle des cités grecques*. Bordeaux.
2012. "Entre Crimée et Bosphore: d'un Parthenos à l'autre." *Mètis N.S.* 10: 289-308.

- D'Ercole, M.C. 2012. *Histoires méditerranéennes. Aspects de la colonisation grecque de l'Occident à la Mer Noire (VIII^e-IV^e siècles av. J.-C.)*. Paris.
- Eck, B. 2013. "Thasos ou l'aventure coloniale en pays thrace." In: F. Delrieux and O. Mariaud (eds.), *Communautés nouvelles dans l'Antiquité grecque. Mouvements, intégrations et représentations*. Chambery: 63-81.
- Ehrhardt, N. 1987. "Die politischen Beziehungen zwischen den griechischen Schwarzmeergründungen und ihren Mutterstädten. Ein Beitrag zur Bedeutung von Kolonialverhältnissen in Griechenland." In: A. Fol (ed.), *Actes du IX^e congrès international d'épigraphie grecque et latine (31.8-7.9.1987)*. Acta Centri Historiae. Terra Antiqua Balcanica II. Veliko Tărnovo and Sofia: 78-117.
- Ferraioli, F. 2012. *L'Hekatomystis: analisi della documentazione*. Tivoli (Rome).
- Fischer-Hansen, T., T.H. Nielsen, and C. Ampolo. 2004. "Sikelia." In: M.H. Hansen and T.H. Nielsen (eds.), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*. Oxford and New York: 172-248.
- Fontenrose, J.E. 1988. *Didyma. Apollo's Oracle, Cult, and Companions*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
- Guldager Bilde, P. 2009. "Quantifying Black Sea Artemis. Some Methodological Reflections." In: T. Fischer-Hansen and B. Poulsen (eds.), *From Artemis to Diana. The Goddess of Man and Beast*. Acta Hyperborea 12: 303-332.
- Hamon, P. 2009. "Institutions des cités grecques." *Annuaire de l'école pratique des hautes études (EPHE), Section des sciences historiques et philologiques* 140: 104-106.
- Hanell, K. 1934. *Megarische Studien*. Lund.
- Hasluck, F.W. 1910. *Cyzicus*. Cambridge.
- Herda, A. 2016. "Megara and Miletos. Colonizing with Apollo. A Structural Comparison of Religious and Political Institutions in Two Archaic Greek Polis States." In: Robu and Bîrzescu: 15-128.
- Jameson, M.H., D.R. Jordan, and R.D. Kotansky. 1993. *A lex sacra from Selinous*. Durham.
- Knoepfler, D. 2008. "Épigraphie et histoire des cités grecques." *Annuaire du Collège de France 2007-2008. Résumé des cours et travaux* 108: 593-619.
- Lepore, E. 1978. "Città-stato e movimenti coloniali: struttura economica e dinamica sociale." In: *Storia e civiltà dei Greci. I. Origini e sviluppo della città. Il medioevo greco*. Milan: 183-253.
- Lewis, D. 1984. "Democratic Institutions and their Diffusion." In: *Actes du VIII^e Congrès international d'épigraphie grecque et latine (Athènes, 3-9 Octobre 1982)*. Athens: 55-61 (= D.M. Lewis. 1997. *Selected Papers in Greek and Near Eastern History*. Edited by P. J. Rhodes. Oxford: 51-59).
- Lordkipanidzé, O. and P. Lévêque. (eds.) 1999. *Religions du Pont-Euxin*. Besançon-Paris.
- Loukopoulou, L.D. 1989. *Contribution à l'histoire de la Thrace propontique durant la période archaïque*. Athens.
- Makarov, I.A. and S.V. Ushakov. 2008. "A Red-Figure Cylix with an Inscription from the Excavations in Chersonesus Taurica." *Journal of Ancient History*: 173-183.
- Malkin, I. 2011. *A Small Greek World. Networks in the Ancient Mediterranean*. Oxford.
2016. "Greek Colonisation: The Right to Return." In: L. Donnellan, V. Nizzo, and G.-J. Burgers (eds.), *Conceptualising Early Colonisation*. Rome: 27-50.
- Meyer, E. 1932. "Megara." *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* 15: 152-205.
- Müller, C. 2016. "Globalization, Transnationalism, and the Local in Ancient Greece." *Oxford Handbooks Online*.
- Reichert-Südbeck, P. 2000. *Kulte von Korinth und Syrakus. Vergleich zwischen einer Metropolis und ihrer Apoikia*. Dettelbach.
- Robert, L. 1939. "Hellenica. I. Inscriptions de Pagai en Mégaride relatives à un arbitrage." *Revue Philologique* 13: 97-122 (= 1969. *Opera Minora Selecta*. Vol. II. Amsterdam: 1250-1275).
1959. "Les inscriptions grecques de Bulgarie." *Revue Philologique* 85: 165-236 (= 1989. *Opera Minora Selecta*. Vol. V. Amsterdam: 195-266).

1980. *À travers l'Asie Mineure. Poètes et prosateurs, monnaies grecques, voyageurs et géographie*. Paris.
- Robu, A. 2010–2011. “Traditions et rapprochements onomastiques dans les cités grecques de la Mer Noire: quelques exemples tirés du “monde mégarien”.” *Il Mar Nero* 8: 281–293.
2012. “Les établissements mégariens de la Propontide et du Pont-Euxin.” *Pallas* 89: 181–195.
2013. “Le culte de Poséidon à Mégare et dans ses colonies.” *Dacia* 57: 65–80.
- 2014a. *Mégare et les établissements mégariens de Sicile, de la Propontide et du Pont-Euxin*. Bern.
- 2014b. “Byzance et Chalcédoine à l’époque hellénistique: entre alliance et rivalités.” In: V. Cojocaru, A. Coşkun, and M. Dana (eds.), *Interconnectivity in the Mediterranean and Pontic World during the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*. Cluj-Napoca: 187–206.
- 2016a. “Callatis and the Delphic Oracle. On the Local Pantheon of a West Pontic City (4th–2nd Centuries B.C.).” *Ancient West and East* 15: 183–193.
- 2016b. “Sur une coutume épigraphique de Mégare: les tablettes funéraires inscrites.” In: Robu and Bîrzescu: 333–375.
- Robu, A. and I. Bîrzescu. (eds.) 2016. *Mégarika. Nouvelles recherches sur Mégare, les cités de la Propontide et du Pont-Euxin*. Paris.
- Schachter, A. 1986. *Cults of Boiotia 2. Herakles to Poseidon*. BICS. Suppl. 38.2. London.
- Smith, P.J. 2008. *The Archaeology and Epigraphy of Hellenistic and Roman Megaris, Greece*. Oxford.
- Stickler, T. 2010. *Korinth und seine Kolonien. Die Stadt am Isthmus im Mächtegefüge des klassischen Griechenland*. Berlin.
- Torelli, M. 2005. “Architettura greca di Sicilia: il ruolo dell’ideologia.” In: P. Minà (ed.), *Urbanistica e architettura nella Sicilia greca*. Palermo: 8–9.
- Trümpy, C. 1997. *Untersuchungen zu den altgriechischen Monatsnamen und Monatsfolgen*. Heidelberg.
- Vatin, C. 1993a. “Citoyenneté et ethnique des colonies grecques. À propos de Diodore XV, 18.” *Anatolia Antiqua* II: 71–80.
- 1993b. “Offrandes des Liparéens à Delphes.” *Ostraka* 2.1: 145–167.
- Voutiras, E. 2008. “La réconciliation des Dikaiopolites. Une nouvelle inscription de Dikaia de Thrace, colonie d’Érétrie.” *Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres. Comptes rendus des séances de l’Académie*: 781–792.